REMARKS

This is a Response to the Final Office Action mailed November 13, 2007, in which a three (3) month Shortened Statutory Period for Response has been set, due to expire February 13, 2008. Claims 1-6, 9-17, 19, 21-23, 25-26 and 28 are currently amended. Claims 7, 18, 20 and 24 have been previously canceled without prejudice. Claims 30-35 have been added. No new matter has been added to the application. The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090. Claims 1-6, 8-17, 19, 21-23, and 25-35 are pending.

A Request For Continued Examination (RCE) is filed concurrently with this Amendment so that the final Office Action is effectively made non-final. Under 37 U.S.C. 1.114, the effect of the RCE, which makes the instant Office Action non-final, is to cause examination of the instant application to remain open. Accordingly, amendments submitted herein are to be entered as a matter of right, and each claim is entitled to continued examination, particularly with respect to the responses provided herein. For example, new claim limitations have been introduced in the current claims and in new claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 19, 21-23, 26, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wichert ("PV-Diesel Hybrid Energy Systems for Remote Area Power Generation – A Review of Current Practice and Future Developments"), hereinafter "Wichert."

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "a dc device coupled to the dc bus bar to detect the electrical power required in the ac network." (Emphasis added.)

Wichert does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 1. In particular, Wichert does not teach or suggest a dc device coupled to a dc bus to measure power required in an ac network. The final Office Action of September 12, 2007 states that Wichert discloses both AC and DC loads, and controlling generators based on the measured net load (i.e., DC and AC loads). The September 12, 2007 Office Action contends that "In order to measure DC load demand, it is inherent that one would have to use a device connected to the DC bus bar" and "The only other places to measure power demand are the load itself (which would require a load

retrofit), the power sources (not indicative of load demand since they are not always on) or the AC bus bar (which would only show AC net load)." In other words, the September 12, 2007 Office Action contends that it is inherent for one to use a device connected to the dc bus for measuring the DC load (i.e., power required for a dc network) of Wichert and a further device connected to the ac bus for measuring the AC load (i.e., power required for an ac network) of Wichert. Furthermore, the November 13, 2007 Office Action explicitly states that "Wichert clearly discloses a DC device for detecting the power required in the DC network."

Wichert and the present Office Action are silent as to what type of device (i.e. AC or DC) and what type of bus (i.e., AC or DC) would be used to detect electrical power in an AC network. Wichert has been alleged to show a DC device and a DC bus to detect power in a DC network. Figure 1 of Wichert shows an AC bus connected to an AC load, but shows nothing about a DC bus and a DC device coupled to the AC load to detect power.

Thus, Wichert does not teach or suggest "a dc device coupled to the dc bus bar to detect the electrical power required in the ac network," as recited in amended claim 1. Consequently, claim 1 is patentable over Wichert as are claims 3, 4, 8, 26, 27, and 29, which depend therefrom.

Amended claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, "detecting electrical power required in an alternating current (ac) network with a dc device coupled to a dc bus bar." (Emphasis added.)

Wichert does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 19. In particular, Wichert does not teach or suggest detecting the power required in an ac network by way of a dc device connected to a dc bus. As discussed above, the final Office Action of September 12, 2007 states that Wichert discloses both AC and DC loads, and controlling generators based on the measured net load (i.e., DC and AC loads). The September 12, 2007 Office Action contends that "In order to measure DC load demand, it is inherent that one would have to use a device connected to the DC bus bar" and "The only other places to measure power demand are the load itself (which would require a load retrofit), the power sources (not indicative of load demand since they are not always on) or the AC bus bar (which would only show AC net load)." In other words, the September 12, 2007 Office Action contends that it is inherent for one to measure the DC load (i.e., power required for a dc network) of Wichert by connecting a device to the dc bus

and to measure the AC load (i.e., power required for an ac network) of Wichert by connecting a further device to the ac bus. Furthermore, the November 13, 2007 Office Action explicitly states that "Wichert clearly discloses a DC device for detecting the power required in the DC network."

Thus, Wichert does not teach or suggest "detecting electrical power required in an alternating current (ac) network with a dc device coupled to a dc bus bar," as disclosed in claim 19. Consequently, claim 19 is patentable over Wichert as are claims 21-23, which depend therefrom.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 11-14, 16-17, 25, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wichert in view of De Zeeuw ("On the Components of a Wind Turbine Autonomous Energy System").

Wichert and De Zeeuw do not teach or suggest the invention recited in claims 2, 11-14, 16-17, 25, and 28, which depend from claim 1. In particular, De Zeeuw does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 that are missing from Wichert. More specifically, De Zeeuw does not teach or suggest a dc device coupled to a dc bus to measure power required in an ac network, as recited in claim 1. Instead the Office Action has cited De Zeeuw only for allegedly teaching a first energy producer, a synchronous generator and a converter having a rectifier, dc link and an inverter. Such is unrelated to the missing teaching of Wichert. As such, Wichert and De Zeeuw fail to teach the invention of claims 2, 11-14, 16-17, 25, and 28, which depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 2, 11-14, 16-17, 25, and 28 are nonobvious in view of Wichert and De Zeeuw.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wichert in view of Da Ponte (U.S. Patent 6,175,217).

Wichert and Da Ponte do not teach or suggest the invention recited in claims 5 and 10, which depend from claim 1. In particular, Da Ponte does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 that are missing from Wichert. More specifically, Da Ponte does not teach or suggest a dc device coupled to a dc bus to measure power required in an ac network, as recited in claim 1. Instead the Office Action has cited Da Ponte only for purportedly teaching a flywheel energy storage device . Such is unrelated to the missing teaching of Wichert. As such, Wichert and Da

Ponte fail to teach the invention of claims 5 and 10, which depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 5 and 10 are nonobvious in view of Wichert and Da Ponte.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wichert in view of Jaunich (U.S. Patent 6,605,880).

Wichert and Jaunich do not teach or suggest the invention recited in claim 6, which depends from claim 1. In particular, Jaunich does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 that are missing from Wichert. More specifically, Jaunich does not teach or suggest a dc device coupled to a dc bus to measure power required in an ac network, as recited in claim 1. Instead the Office Action has cited Jaunich only for purportedly teaching multiple internal combustion engines. Such is unrelated to the missing teaching of Wichert. As such, Wichert and Jaunich fail to teach the invention of claim 6, which depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 6 is nonobvious in view of Wichert and Jaunich.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wichert in view of De Zeeuw, and further in view of Suzuki (JP 2000-073931A).

Wichert, De Zeeuw and Suzuki do not teach or suggest the invention recited in claim 9, which depends from claim 1. In particular, Suzuki does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 that are missing from Wichert and De Zeeuw. More specifically, Suzuki does not teach or suggest a dc device coupled to a dc bus to measure power required in an ac network, as recited in claim 1. Instead the Office Action has cited Suzuki only for purportedly teaching the limitation of claim 9. Such is unrelated to the missing teachings of Wichert and De Zeeuw. As such, Wichert, De Zeeuw and Suzuki fail to teach the invention of claim 9, which depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 9 is nonobvious in view of Wichert, De Zeeuw and Suzuki.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wichert in view of Offringa (EP 046,530 A1).

Wichert and Offringa do not teach or suggest the invention recited in claim 15, which depends from claim 1. In particular, Offringa does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 that are missing from Wichert. More specifically, Offringa does not teach or suggest a dc device coupled to a dc bus to measure power required in an ac network, as recited in claim 1. Instead the Office Action has cited Offringa only for purportedly teaching using "variations in a

wind turbine's power output to control a pump station, in order to pump water to increased heights (abstract, lines 16-20)." Such is unrelated to the missing teaching of Wichert. As such, Wichert and Offringa fail to teach the invention of claim 15, which depends from claim 1. Thus, claim 15 is nonobvious in view of Wichert and Offringa.

New Claims 30-35

As discussed above, claim 12 is allowable over the art of record. Consequently, new claims 30-33 which depend from allowable claim 12 are likewise allowable.

New claims 34-35 respectively recite that the intermediate storage device includes a flywheel and a capacitor. Page 4 of the present Office Action has cited Figure 2 and page 222 of Wichert. However, it is respectfully submitted that Wichert only discloses PV arrays and batteries in theses passages, not a flywheel or capacitor.

Other claim amendments

Various other amendments are made to the claims as shown to provide appropriate antecedent basis, to make the language within and between the claims consistent, to more precisely recite the subject matter contained therein, to remove extraneous unnecessary limitations, and/or to otherwise place such claims in better form.

Furthermore, claims 1, 10, 13, 21, and 25 are amended to clarify that certain recitations contained therein and in their related claims do not fall within the scope of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

Conclusion

Overall, the cited references do not singly, or in any motivated combination, teach or suggest the claimed features of the embodiments recited in independent claims 1 and 19, and thus such claims are allowable. Because the remaining claims depend from the allowable independent claims, and also because they include additional limitations, such claims are likewise allowable. If the undersigned agent has overlooked a relevant teaching in any of the

references, the Examiner is requested to point out specifically where such teaching may be found.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application and timely allow all pending claims. Examiner Amrany is encouraged to contact Mr. Stern by telephone to discuss the above and any other distinctions between the claims and the applied references, if desired. If the Examiner notes any informalities in the claims, he is encouraged to contact Mr. Stern by telephone to expediently correct such informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

Seed Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Ronald Stern/
Ronald Stern
Registration No. 59,705

RS:vsj

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
(206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1094120_1